

# **FINAL REPORT**

## **2<sup>nd</sup> Mini Children and Family Service Review**

### **Eastern Service Area**

**April 19 - 21, 2010**

**Prepared by Micaela Swigle**

**Executive Summary**  
**Children and Family Services Review**  
**Eastern Service Area**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**Final Report: Child and Family Services Review**  
**Eastern Service Area - April 19<sup>th</sup> - 21<sup>st</sup> 2010**

This document presents the findings from the 2<sup>nd</sup> Mini Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) for the Eastern Service Area. The Nebraska CQI (Continuous Quality Improvement) team has identified Mini CFSR Review as an important activity for assessing the performance of each service area and the state as a whole with regard to achieving positive outcomes for children and their families. Mini CFSR Reviews are scheduled to take place in each Service Area once every quarter in year 2010 and 2011.

The Eastern Service area Mini CFSR Review was conducted on April 19<sup>th</sup> to April 21<sup>st</sup> 2010. The period under review for the onsite case review was April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2009 through April 5<sup>th</sup>, 2010. The findings were derived from file reviews of 19 cases (11 foster care and 8 in home services) which were randomly selected from all open child welfare cases at some time during the period under review. The reviews also included interviews with parents, children, foster parents, and CFS specialists, to assess items 17-20 within the review tool.

In the Eastern Service Area, eleven of the 19 cases were brought to the attention of DHHS for juvenile justice services and the remaining eight cases were abuse/neglect cases. The cases were from the Omaha and Papillion Offices.

The review teams were re-structured for this review due to limited availability of DHHS Staff and Visinet ending their Out of Home Contract with the State. The re-structuring resulted in some cases being reviewed by an individual reviewer instead of a team. The review was completed by four teams of two reviewers made up of both staff from DHHS and Contractors (KVC & NFC). A total of ten cases were reviewed by a team. There were four cases that were reviewed by NFC and KVC Staff members and five cases reviewed by the QA Staff. All of these staff members participated in the previous review. 100% of the cases were reviewed by the following second level reviewers: Micaela Swigle and Kathy Anstine.

### **Background Information**

The Mini CFSR is modeled after the Federal CFSR reviews and assesses the Service Area's performance on 23 items relevant to seven outcomes.

With regards to outcomes, an overall rating of Strength or Area Needing Improvement (ANI) is assigned to each of the 23 items incorporated in the seven outcomes depending on the percentage of cases that receive a Strength rating in the onsite case review. An item is assigned an overall rating of Strength if 95 percent of the applicable cases reviewed are rated as Strength. Performance ratings for each of the seven outcomes are based on item ratings for each case. A service area may be rated as having "substantially achieved," "partially achieved," or "not achieved" the outcome. The determination of whether a service area is in substantial conformity with a particular outcome is based on the percentage of cases that were determined to have

substantially achieved that outcome. In order for a service area to be in substantial conformity with a particular outcome, 95 percent of the cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome. The standard for substantial conformity is based on the standard set for Federal CFSR. The standards are based on the belief that because child welfare agencies work with our country's most vulnerable children and families, only the highest standards of performance should be acceptable. The focus of the CFSR process is on continuous quality improvement; standards are set high to ensure ongoing attention to the goal of achieving positive outcomes for children and families with regard to safety, permanency, and well-being.

A Service Area that is not in substantial conformity with a particular outcome must work with their local CQI Team to develop and implement a Program Improvement Plan (PIP) to address the areas of concern associated with that outcome.

### **Key CFSR Findings Regarding Outcomes**

The 2<sup>nd</sup> Mini CFSR identified several areas of high performance in the Eastern Service Area with regard to achieving desired outcomes for children. Although the service area did not achieve substantial conformity with any of the seven CFSR outcomes, the Service Area did achieve overall ratings of Strength for the individual indicators pertaining to Item 2 repeat maltreatment, Item 5 foster care reentry and Item 11 placing children in close proximity to their parents.

The mini CFSR review also identified key areas of concern with regard to achieving outcomes for children and families. Concerns were identified with regard to Safety Outcome 1 (Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect), which was substantially achieved in 33 percent of the reviewed cases. The lowest rating within this outcome was for Item 1 (timeliness of investigations), which was rated as a Strength in one out of the three applicable reviewed cases. Safety Outcome 2 (children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate) was substantially achieved in 63 percent of the reviewed cases.

Concerns were also identified with regards to Permanency Outcome 1, (Children have permanency and stability in their living situations) which was substantially achieved in nine percent of reviewed cases. Within Permanency Outcome 1, the Eastern Service Area's lowest ratings were for Item 7 (permanency goal for child) was rated as a Strength in 18 percent of the reviewed cases; Item 8 (reunification, guardianship or permanent placement) rated as a Strength 50 percent of the reviewed cases; Item 9 (adoption) was rated as a Strength in 0 percent of the reviewed cases; and Item 10 (other planned living arrangements) rated as a Strength in 50 percent of the cases reviewed cases.

Concerns were also identified with regards to Permanency Outcome 2, (Continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children) which was substantially achieved in 36 percent of the reviewed cases. Within Permanency Outcome 2, the Eastern Service Area's lowest ratings were for Item 12 (placement with siblings) was rated as a Strength in 50 percent of reviewed cases; and Item 15 (Relative Placement) was rated as a Strength in 50 percent of the reviewed cases.

In addition, concerns also were identified with regard to Well-Being Outcome 1 (Families have enhanced capacity to provide for children's needs), which was substantially achieved in 16 percent of the cases reviewed. The lowest ratings were for Item 17 (needs and services to child, parents, and foster parents), which was rated as a Strength in 26 percent of the reviewed cases; Item 18 (child and family involvement in case planning) was rated as a Strength in 32 percent of

the reviewed cases; Item 19 (caseworker visits with child) was rated as a Strength in 32 percent; and Item 20 (caseworker visits with parent (s)) was rated as a Strength in 11 percent of the reviewed cases.

Well-Being Outcome 2 (Children receive appropriate services to meet their education needs) was substantially achieved in 59 percent of reviewed cases. Well-Being Outcome 3 (Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs) was substantially achieved in 33 percent of reviewed cases. The lowest rating was Item 22 (physical health of child), which was rated as a Strength in 36 percent of the reviewed cases.

## KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO OUTCOMES

### I. SAFETY

*Outcome S1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.*

#### Status of Safety Outcome S1

	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	1	33%
Partially Achieved:	1	33%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	1	33%
Not Applicable:	16	84%

#### *Reviewer Comments S1:*

- Workers need to document reasons for delays in face to face contacts with child victims and completion of Safety Assessments in a timely manner.

#### **Item 1. Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment**

In assessing Item 1, reviewers were to determine whether the response to a maltreatment report occurring during the period under review had been initiated in accordance with child welfare agency policy. A new intake tool was implemented in 2003 which is based upon a priority response model with Priority 1 calling for a response by the worker within 24 hours of the time that the report is received by DHHS. Priority 2 designated reports are to have face to face contact with the alleged victim by Protection and Safety within 0 to 5 days from the time the intake is received and Priority 3 has a response time of 0-10 days. Data is generated monthly to ensure compliance with the response times.

#### *Review Findings:*

- Three of the 19 cases reviewed were applicable to the Item.
- One (33%) case was rated as a Strength.
  - One foster care case was rated as a Strength.
- Two (67%) cases was rated as an Area Needing Improvement.
  - One case was an in home case and the other cases was a foster care case.

***Strength:***

- DHHS successfully initiated the investigation on a Priority 1 intake, investigation was initiated on the same day as the intake receipt.

***Area Needing Improvement:***

- Two of the three cases did not meet timelines for the initial contact.
- Priority 2 intake was received and there was a delay in contact with no documentation to support delay.
- Children were placed into DHHS temporary care and custody on May 19, 2009 by Douglas County Court. DHHS was notified on June 8, 2009 of the court order placing the children into DHHS temporary care and custody. Intake was loaded on the system on June 9, 2009 with intake status as the intake did not meet criteria. Intake was assigned to Ongoing Unit for Safety Assessment on June 11, 2009 and worker did not make contact with the family until July 10, 2009.

**Item 2. Repeat maltreatment**

**In assessing this Item, reviewers were to determine whether there had been at least one substantiated/inconclusive/petition to be filed maltreatment report during the period under review, and if so, whether another substantiated/inconclusive/petition to be filed report occurred within a 6 month period before or after the report identified. Cases were considered not applicable for assessment if the child or family had never had a maltreatment report.**

***Review Findings:***

- Two of the 19 cases reviewed were applicable to the Item.
- Both cases (100%) were rated as Strengths.
  - One of the cases was a foster care case and the other case was an in home case.

***Strength:***

- Case had one substantiated intake during the period under review; intake was not received within 6-month period before or after any maltreatment report.
- Case had a substantiated intake received during the period under review. There was an additional substantiated maltreatment report within 6-months. The intakes did not involve similar circumstances; one intake was domestic violence between parents and the other intake was improper discipline.

***Area Needing Improvement:***

- None noted.

***Outcome S2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.***

**Status of Safety Outcome S2**

	<b>Total Number</b>	<b>Total Percentage</b>
Substantially Achieved:	12	63%
Partially Achieved:	3	16%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	4	21%
Not Applicable:	0	0%

***Reviewer Comments S2:***

- Not assessing all of the children within the family. Reviewers cited concerns of aggression, mental health and appropriate boundaries.
- One case did not have background checks or an ICPC prior to youth being placed with a non-custodial parent.
- No formal assessment prior to case closure.
- Six OJS cases did not present with any safety concerns for the target child or any other child (ren) living within the family unit.

**Item 3. Services to family to protect child (ren) in home and prevent removal**

**For this Item, reviewers were to assess whether in responding to a substantiated/inconclusive/petition to be filed maltreatment report or risk of harm, the agency made diligent efforts to provide services to families to prevent removal of children from their homes while at the same time ensuring their safety. Twelve of the 19 cases were excluded from the assessment because there were no substantiated/inconclusive/petition to be filed maltreatment reports or identified risks of harm to children in the home during the period under review, the target child entered foster care prior to the period under review and there were no other children in the home who were at risk of maltreatment or the target child was reunified during the period under review and the reviewer determined there were no safety concerns.**

***Review Findings:***

- Seven of the 19 cases reviewed were applicable to the Item.
- Five (71%) of the seven cases were rated as a Strength.
  - One of the five cases was a foster care case and four were in home cases.
- Two (29%) of the seven cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.
  - One case was a foster care case and the other was an in home case.

***Strength:***

- Services were implemented in order to maintain the child (ren) in the home.

***Area Needing Improvement:***

- The following concerns were documented in the case;
  - therapist recommended the three children remaining with their mother receive family support or therapeutic services to assist these children to cope with living in their mother's household due to the mother being a hoarder
  - unsafe environment due to the mother's hoarding was not addressed
  - father threatened to harm all of the children
  - mother ceased communication with the Agency.
- Incident resulting in the removal of the child was not a representative pattern of the parents' behavior. Agency needed to provide services within the home, allowing the child to remain in the home with no disruption to the family unit.

**Item 4. Risk of harm to child**

The assessment of Item 4 required reviewers to determine whether DHHS had made, or was making, diligent efforts to reduce the risk of harm to the children involved in each case. Reviewers rated this item as a Strength if the agency terminated the child's parent's rights as a means of decreasing risk of harm for the child (for example, a termination of parental rights would prevent a child from being returned to a home in which the child would be at risk) and has taken action to minimize other risks to the child (for example, preventing contact with individuals who pose a risk to the child's safety). If a case is/was open for services for a reason other than a court substantiated, inconclusive, petition to be filed or unfounded report of abuse or neglect, or apparent risk of harm to the child(ren) (for example, a juvenile justice case), reviewers were to document this information and rate the item as not applicable. Note, however, that for a child (ren) noted as a "child in need of supervision" or "delinquent", reviewers were to explore and determine whether there was a risk of harm to the child, in addition to the other reasons the case may have been opened, prior to rating it as not applicable. Cases were not applicable for assessment of this item if there was no current or prior risk of harm to the children in the family.

***Review Findings:***

- All of the 19 cases were applicable to the Item.
- 13 (68%) of the 19 cases were rated as a Strength.
  - Eight cases were foster care cases and five were in home cases.
  - Please note that six of these cases were OJS, no areas of safety concerns were present.
- 6 (32%) of the 19 cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.
  - Three cases were foster care cases and three were in home cases.
  - Please note that two cases were non-court involved cases and one was a status offense case.

***Strength:***

- Ongoing Safety Assessment completed as indicated.
- Safety Assessment completed prior to reunification.
- YLS completed several times throughout the case.

***Area Needing Improvement:***

- Updated Safety Assessment contained little update from previous assessment to indicate the family's progress and elimination of safety threats.
- Limited contacts between worker and all family members, documentation did not indicate safety was addressed informally during required contacts.

- Safety Assessment did not fully assess all the children within the family and all safety concerns.
- Safety Assessment was not completed upon placement changes and reunification with parent.

## II. PERMANENCY

***Outcome P1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.***

### **Status of Permanency Outcome P1**

	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	1	9%
Partially Achieved:	9	82%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	1	9%
Not Applicable:	8	42%

### ***Reviewer Comments P1:***

- There were no foster care re-entries.
- Permanency goals need to be established in a timely manner.
- Concurrent goals are established but no active efforts are made by the Agency to achieve these goals.
- Agency is not actively pursuing Adoption as a concurrent goal. According to documentation, Agency is not exploring the option of Adoption with foster parents and not continuously addressing the issue with parents.
- Goals are not always appropriate i.e. child was placed in the parental home for several months and the permanency goal is reunification. Goals need to be updated regularly.
- Strategies set in place are not appropriate to achieve the outcome, especially with Independent Living outcomes.

### **Item 5. Foster care re-entries**

Reviewers rated this assessment as a Strength if during the period under review a child did not have an entry into care within a 12-month period from being discharged from another entry into foster care. Reviewers also rated this item as a Strength if a re-entry was an isolated incident during which the agency did what was reasonable to manage the risk following reunification but the child re-entered care for another reason (for example, the death of a parent). Reviewers rated this item as an Area Needing Improvement if re-entries occurring within a 12-month period were due to the same general reasons or same perpetrators. Reviewers rated this item as Not Applicable if : (1) the child entered foster care before, and remained in foster care during, the period under review; or (2) the child entered foster care before, and exited foster care during, the period under review and there was not another entry into foster care during the period under review.



***Review Findings:***

- Two of the eleven cases were applicable to the Item.
- All cases (100%) were rated as Strengths.

***Strength:***

- In both cases the children entered foster care during the period under review but were not re-entering within 12 months of a prior foster care episode.

***Area Needing Improvement:***

- None noted.

**Item 6. Stability of foster care placement**

**In assessing this Item, reviewers were to determine whether the child experienced multiple placement changes during the period under review, and if so, whether the changes in placement settings were necessary to achieve the child's permanency goal or meet the child's service needs.**

***Review Findings:***

- All eleven out of home cases were applicable to the Item.
- Nine (82%) of the eleven cases were rated as Strength.
- Two (18%) of the eleven cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.

***Strength:***

- Four cases, the child was able to remain in the same out of home placement the entire period under review.
- Five cases, the child was reunified with parent, informal and formal supports are in place.

***Area Needing Improvement:***

- In one case the first move during period under review was a planned move by the Agency to benefit the case plan goals and place the child into a least restrictive environment prior to a planned reunification with the father. Documentation suggested that this placement into a least restrictive was not stable as there were short periods of time in which the child was missing prior to running away. Once child was located the agency arranged placement with the father.
- During the period under review, the child was placed in a foster home, moved to another foster home for approximately 6-weeks and then returned to the prior foster home. Documentation indicated that the first foster parent was exhausted by the child's needs and the next foster home was unable to provide care due to the child's high level of supervision and attention seeking behaviors. It did not appear the placement change between foster homes promoted the achievement of goals or met the child's needs.

**Item 7. Permanency goal for child**

**In assessing this Item, reviewers were to determine whether DHHS had established an appropriate permanency goal for the child in a timely manner, including filing for termination of parental rights when relevant. Reviewers examined the appropriateness of a goal that ultimately rules out adoption, guardianship, or return to family. Reviewers assessed whether the child's best interests were thoroughly considered by DHHS in setting a goal of other planned living arrangement, and that such a decision is /was continually**

reviewed for ongoing appropriateness. Cases were assigned a rating of Strength for this item when reviewers determined that DHHS had established an appropriate permanency goal in a timely manner. Cases were assigned a rating of Area Needing Improvement when permanency goals were not changed in a timely manner to reflect current case circumstances, when it was apparent that reunification was unlikely to happen, termination of parental rights was not filed when the child had been foster care for 15 of the past 22 months and no compelling reasons were noted in the file, or the goal established for the child was not appropriate. Cases were identified as Not Applicable if the child was not in foster care.

***Review Findings:***

- All eleven out of home cases reviewed were applicable to the Item.
- Two (18%) of the eleven cases were rated as a Strength.
- Nine (82%) of the eleven cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.
- In cases applicable to this item, the ESA had the following:

**Primary Permanency Goals:**

- Reunification - 4 cases
- Family Preservation - 4 cases
- Independent Living – 3 cases

**Concurrent Goals:**

- No concurrent goal - 3 cases
- Independent Living – 2 cases
- Self Sufficiency – 3 cases
- Adoption - 1 case
- Guardianship – 1 case
- Reunification – 1 case

***Strength:***

- In two cases rated as a Strength, permanency goals were established in a timely manner and appeared to be appropriate for the child's needs for permanency and case circumstances.

***Area Needing Improvement:***

- Permanency goals are not established within the 60 day timeframe set by DHHS.
- Permanency goals are not updated within the case plan or informally documented within the case. Goals are not changed when the situation for the family changes i.e. permanency goal is family preservation and the child is in out of home care and vice versa, goal is reunification and the child is at home.
- Concurrent plan of reunification when child is 16 years old and residing in the home, concurrent plan of Independent Living would have been more appropriate.
- Inappropriate utilization of Self-Sufficiency.

**Item 8. Reunification, Guardianship or Permanent Placement with Relatives**

In assessing these cases reviewers determined whether DHHS had achieved children's goals of reunification, guardianship or placement with relatives in a timely manner. If the goals had not been achieved in a timely manner reviewers determined whether DHHS had made diligent efforts to achieve the goals.

***Review Findings:***

- Six of the eleven out of home cases were applicable to the Item.
- Three (50%) of the six cases were rated as a Strength.
- Three (50%) of the six cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.

***Strength:***

- In two cases youth remained in same foster care setting, one reuniting within a month and the other reuniting within five months.
- One case clearly documented needed services and supports were implemented but the permanency goal of reunification was not achieved due to the specialized needs of the child.

***Area Needing Improvement:***

- Child's behaviors and mental health were prevalent, extensive services were provided to the youth and both parents. Services included regular visitation, therapy, family support and family team meetings in order to assist in achieving the goal. Documentation indicates that reunification may have taken place earlier with continued in home supports.
- No active efforts to achieve the concurrent goal of guardianship.

**Item 9. Adoption**

**In assessing this Item, reviewers were to determine whether appropriate and timely efforts (within 24 months of the most recent entry into foster care) had been or were being made to achieve finalized adoption.**

***Review Findings:***

- Two of the eleven out of home cases reviewed were applicable to the Item.
- No (0%) cases were rated as Strength.
- Two (100%) of the cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.

***Strength:***

- None noted.

***Area Needing Improvement:***

- Adoption was a concurrent goal in both cases. The Agency did not appear to make active efforts to achieve the concurrent goal of adoption.

**Item 10. Permanency goal of other planned permanent living arrangement**

**Reviewers determined whether the agency had made or was making diligent efforts to assist children in attaining their goals related to other planned permanent living arrangements (Independent Living, Self-Sufficiency or Family Preservation).**

***Review Findings:***

- Six of the eleven out of home cases were applicable to the Item.
- Three (50%) of the six cases were rated as a Strength.
- Three (50%) of the six cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.

***Strength:***

- Youth entered adult treatment facility in order to meet youth's specialized needs.

- PALS referral was made and PALS report on youth's progress was contained in the case file. Court Report documented several efforts including employment, post high-school education and transportation needs being met for the youth to achieve Independent Living.
- Detailed Independent Living Plan was contained in the file. Child stepped down from treatment level of care into a community setting in order to continue stabilization in preparation for adult living.

***Area Needing Improvement:***

- Independent Living Skills assessment was completed and minimal Independent Living needs were included in the case plan that included budgeting, education, employment and decision-making skills. There was a lack of documentation located in the case file that budgeting and employment were actively being pursued. The youth scored low in many areas of the assessment, it may have been more productive to identify basic needs such as house cleaning, laundry skills, community resources, etc. Agency efforts to achieve the concurrent plan of Independent Living are unclear in the case file.
- Concurrent goal of Independent Living is not being actively pursued by the Agency. Court Report indicated there is an Independent Living Plan, but it was not located in the file.
- Youth is in a stable foster home that has agreed to provide placement until age 19. Agency needed to make more effort to prepare youth for Independent Living. There was not an assessment of the youth's Independent Living skills and no post services were offered in order to further prepare the youth for independence. Foster parent didn't seem to be working on the youth's Independent Living skills; majority of the focus was on getting youth their GED with no attention to the other skills needed to live independently.

***Outcome P2: Continuity of family relationships and connections are preserved for children.***

**Status of Permanency Outcome P2**

	<b>Total Number</b>	<b>Total Percentage</b>
Substantially Achieved:	7	64%
Partially Achieved:	4	36%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	0	0%
Not Applicable:	8	42%

***Reviewer Comments P2:***

- Staff makes all efforts to place youth in their communities and near their families.
- Cases where youth were not in the same community were due to the youths' behaviors requiring a structured behavioral setting and youths' specialized treatment needs.

- ICWA documentation in the file needs to include the individual that was asked to provide the information regarding tribal affiliation. If there is some indication tribal affiliation is possible, documentation needs to reflect that the agency attempted to confirm or rule out tribal affiliation.
- Document efforts to provide visitations with siblings and fathers.
- Efforts need to focus on early relative searches and particularly on fathers and their side of the family.
- Documentation should indicate if relatives are appropriate or inappropriate for placement.
- There was a lack of documentation showing that workers promoted the relationships of the parents and siblings other than simply providing services to the families. (i.e. attendance at school activities, medical appointments, sporting events etc.)

#### **Item 11. Proximity of foster care placement**

**Reviewers were to determine whether the child's foster care setting was in close proximity to the child's parents or close relatives. Cases determined to be not applicable were those in which termination of parental rights had been completed prior to the period under review, or in which contact with parents was not considered to be in the child's best interest.**

##### ***Review Findings:***

- Eleven of the eleven out of home cases were applicable to the Item.
- All (100%) cases were rated as Strengths.

##### ***Strength:***

- In six of the eleven cases, youth were in the same community as their parents.
- Three cases youth were not residing in the same community as their parents due to the specialized treatment level of care needed for those youth. Visitation continued with the family on a regular basis.
- Two cases had parents residing outside of the State. Visitation opportunities were encouraged between all involved parties.

##### ***Area Needing Improvement:***

- None noted.

#### **Item 12. Placement with siblings**

**Reviewers were to determine whether siblings were or had been placed together and if not, was separation necessary to meet the needs (service or safety needs) of one or more of the children.**

##### ***Review Findings:***

- Two of the eleven out of home cases were applicable to the Item.
- One (50%) case was rated as a Strength.
- One (50%) case was rated as an Area Needing Improvement.

##### ***Strength:***

- In one case, youth placed with siblings in relative foster home.

***Area Needing Improvement:***

- In one case, youth was placed into foster care and then the younger sibling was also placed into foster care with a relative. There is no documentation within the case file regarding the separation of the children.

**Item 13. Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care**

In assessing this Item, reviewers determined whether DHHS had or was making diligent efforts to facilitate visitations between children in foster care and their parents and siblings. Reviewers also determined whether these visits typically occurred with sufficient frequency to meet the needs of the children and families. Non applicable cases were those where the child had no siblings in foster care, if the parents could not be located, and/or if visitation with the parents was considered not in the best interests of the child. Reviewers rated this item for the period under review based on the individual needs of the child and family, rather than on the DHHS policy regarding visitation. The DHHS visitation guidebook recommends a minimum of one visit every two weeks between child and parent unless it would not be in the child's best interest because the parent is the perpetrator of severe physical abuse or sexual abuse. DHHS Policy requires that siblings placed separately must have a minimum of one visit per month. Other forms of communication including phone calls and letters are strongly encouraged.

***Review Findings:***

- All eleven of the out of home cases were applicable to the Item.
- Six (55%) of the eleven cases were rated as a Strength.
- Five (45%) of the eleven cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.

***Strength:***

- In six cases visits between the child and parents were arranged to occur at least weekly.
- In one case diligent efforts were made to involve an out of state father in visitations during his trips to Nebraska.

***Area Needing Improvement:***

- In one case the child's biological parent privately placed the child at a residential facility. During the child's stay at the residential facility, the child was made a ward of the State of Nebraska due to sexualized behaviors. The child's parent resided out of state. There were no documented efforts to encourage visitation or any form of contact between the child and parent.
- File did not indicate that the child was having visitations with parent during youth's stay at the YRTC.
- Parents resided out of state.
- Visitations with fathers.
- Need to provide efforts for sibling visits.

**Item 14. Preserving connections**

Reviewers determined whether DHHS had or was making diligent efforts to preserve the child's primary connection and characteristics while in foster care. Reviewers had to make a professional judgment about the child's primary connections and then explore whether those connections have been preserved through case planning and service delivery.

***Review Findings:***

- All of the eleven out of home cases were applicable to the Item.
- Seven (64%) of the eleven cases were rated as a Strength.
- Four (36%) of the eleven cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.

***Strength:***

- Child was able to maintain same school.
- Connections to community activities were strongly maintained.
- Connections to extended family were encouraged.
- Timely tribal notification, tribal links was considered for placement.

***Area Needing Improvement:***

- Case file lacked documentation to demonstrate efforts to keep youth connected with previous community.
- Documentation is needed in the file to determine what discussions took place with the parents regarding possible affiliation with a Native American Tribe.
- Parent indicated that there may be Native American Heritage. No tribal notification occurred in order to determine eligibility.
- File lacked documentation that there were efforts made to keep connections with the child's extended family members.

**Item 15. Relative placement**

Reviewers had to focus on the title IV-E provision that requires States to consider giving preference to placing the child with relatives, and determine whether the State considered such a placement and how (for example, seeking out and evaluating the child's relatives). Relatives include non-custodial parents, such as fathers not in the home, if applicable to the case. Reviewers had to determine the extent to which the agency identified relatives who had some reasonable degree of relationship with the child and with whom the child might reside. There did not need to be in the case record a formal evaluation of relatives with whom the child might reside, but for reviewers to have answered "yes" evidence must exist, through either the case documentation or the case interviews, that relatives were evaluated and considered. Reviewers rated this item as a Strength if (1) the agency assessed the child's needs and determined that he/she required special services *and* (2) the agency assessed potential relative placements and determined that the relative placements did not have the capacity to meet the child's needs. Reviewers rated this item as a Strength unless no efforts were made to locate or identify relatives for placement, or placement with a family known to the child. Reviewers rated this item as not applicable if (1) the agency determined upon the child's initial entry into care that his/her needs required residential treatment services and a relative placement would be inappropriate, or (2) if relatives were unable to be identified despite the agency's diligent efforts to do so, or in situations such as abandonment in which the identity of the parents and relatives remains unknown despite efforts to identify them.

***Review Findings:***

- Four of the eleven out of home cases were applicable to the Item.
- Two (50%) of the four cases were rated as a Strength.
- Two (50%) of the four cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.



***Strength:***

- In the two cases that were strengths, the child (ren) were placed with relatives and/or maternal and paternal relatives were identified and deemed to be appropriate or inappropriate placement options.

***Area Needing Improvement:***

- Relative placement was not explored in each of the cases.
- There was minimal case file documentation regarding extended family members and their ability to provide placement.

**Item 16. Relationship of child in care with parents**

**In assessing this Item, reviewers determined if there was evidence of a strong, emotionally supportive relationship between the child in foster care and the child's parents during the period under review. Reviewers assigned a rating of Strength for this item when there was evidence of regular visitation between parent and child. Reviewers assigned a rating of Area Needing Improvement when they determined the agency had not made diligent efforts to support the child's relationship with the father or mother. A case was considered not applicable if a relationship with the child's parents was contrary to the child's safety or best interest during the period under review.**

***Review Findings:***

- All eleven out of home cases were applicable to the Item.
- Six (55%) of the eleven cases were rated as a Strength.
- Five (45%) of the eleven cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.

***Strength:***

- In one case the parent's were very involved in the child's educational activities.
- Agency encouraged the parent to schedule medical appointments for the child.
- Efforts were made to strengthen the relationship between parents and children through intensive family preservation services, family therapy, case conferences and family team meetings.

***Area Needing Improvement:***

- Agency did not encourage parent to participate in child's medical care.
- Agency did not follow up on a recommendation for family therapy to occur in order to strengthen the bond between parent and child.
- Agency did not encourage the father's participation in case conferences or connections with child's placement.
- No documented efforts of the agency to maintain the relationship between the child and adoptive mother.
- No documented efforts for YRTC youth to maintain connections with either parent.
- One case lacked documentation that any effort was made to encourage either parent to continue a relationship.



### III. WELL-BEING

*Outcome WB1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.*

#### **Status of Well-Being Outcome WB1**

	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	3	16%
Partially Achieved:	6	32%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	10	53%
Not Applicable:	0	0%

#### ***Reviewer Comments WB1:***

- Many of the in home cases that were areas needing improvement were because ALL children in the home were not assessed and/or worker had no contact with the other children – only the target child.
- Assessment of needs and implementation of services based on those identified needs for both parents needs to be completed by the agency.
- Documentation needs to reflect that parents and children are involved in case planning. Case plans should involve the parents and children from the beginning of case. Interviews supported that parents and children were not involved in case planning, they were aware of case plans but not involved in the development of outcomes.
- Cut and paste of monthly contact narratives results in difficulty determining quality of the contacts.
- Required contacts not as frequent as the case moves towards closure.
- Need to utilize Interpreters for non-English speaking parents.

#### **Item 17. Needs and services of child, parents, foster parents**

In assessing Item 17, reviewers were to determine whether DHHS adequately assessed the needs of children, parents and foster parents AND provided the services to meet those needs. Reviewers rated item 17 as a strength if (1) a needs assessment was conducted for the child (ren), parents, and foster parents, and (2) appropriate services were provided in relation to the identified needs of the target child in foster care cases, or for all children in in-home cases. Education and physical or mental health services to the target child were not rated for this item (these are rated in items 21, 22, and 23). Reviewers had to document whether these services were provided to parents.

#### ***Review Findings:***

- All of the 19 cases were applicable to the Item.
- Five (26%) of the 19 cases were rated as a Strength.
  - 3 foster care cases and 2 in home cases were rated as Strength.
- Fourteen (79%) of the 19 cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.
  - 8 foster care cases and 6 in home cases were rated as Area Needing Improvement.

***Strength: Separating out Items 17A, B, and C.***

- Fourteen of the 19 cases were rated as strengths for assessing the needs and services to the children (17A). Children's needs were assessed through the Nebraska Safety Assessment Tool, family team meetings, private, face to face visits by the worker, interviews with relatives, the Youth Level of Service Inventory, and through formal evaluations. Services provided to meet those needs include Tracker, Drug Screen Testing, Electronic Monitoring, therapy, child care, foster care, respite, community treatment aide and family support services.
- Six of the 19 applicable cases were rated as strengths for assessing the needs and services to the parents (17B). When parental needs were assessed, it was at the initial assessment using the Nebraska Safety Assessment; through face to face visits; family group conferencing; and during family team meetings. Services that were provided to meet those needs include, individual and family therapy, parenting resources, and support groups.
- Five of the eight applicable cases were rated as strengths for assessing the needs and services to the foster parents (17C). When foster parent needs were addressed it was done through monthly face to face meetings, telephone calls, and family team meetings. Services that were provided to meet the needs include family support, child care, clothing vouchers and transportation.

***Area Needing Improvement: Separating out Items 17A, B, and C.***

- Five of the 19 applicable cases were rated as an area needing improvement for assessing the needs and services to children (17A).
- Thirteen of 19 applicable cases were rated as an area needing improvement for assessing the needs and services to the parents (17B).
- Three of the eight applicable cases were rated as an area needing improvement for assessing needs and services to foster parents (17C).

***Additional Reviewer Comments:***

- Five fathers were assessed and services provided based upon those needs. There were eleven cases in which the fathers' needs were not assessed and/or services were not provided by the agency.
- Reviewers found that services were provided but the needs were never assessed.
- Several cases did assess one parent's needs but not both. (This was true for both maternal and paternal sides)
- Inadequate informal assessment of foster parent needs due to the lack of contact between worker and foster parent.
- Services were provided, agency failed to assess needs of parents prior to implemented services.
- In home cases, agency needs to meet the needs of all children. Formal or informal needs assessment should be completed for all children residing in the home.

<b>Item 17</b>	<b>Child</b>	<b>Parent</b>	<b>Foster Parent</b>
Strength:	14	6	5
ANI:	5	13	3
NA:	0	0	11

### **Item 18. Child and family involvement in case planning**

**In assessing this Item, reviewers were to determine whether the agency actively involved the parent(s), guardian, child (ren) and other people identified by the family in the case planning activities relevant to the current case plan. A determination of involvement in case planning required that a parent (guardian) and the child (older than 8 and not incapacitated) had actively participated in identifying the services and goals for the case plan.**

#### ***Review Findings:***

- All cases were applicable to the Item.
- Six (32%) of the 19 cases were rated as a Strength.
  - 4 foster care cases and 2 in home cases were rated as Strength.
- Thirteen (68%) of the 19 cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.
  - 7 foster care cases and 6 in home cases were rated as Area Needing Improvement.

#### ***Strength:***

- In one of the six cases that were strengths, the youth were too young to participate.
- In one case, the child was minimally involved in the case planning process due to development and cognitive functioning.
- Case plan involvement through family team meetings and required contacts with workers.
- In one instance, case documentation reflected the mother was invited and encouraged to participate in case planning on a regular basis, parent continually refused to participate.

#### ***Area Needing Improvement:***

- In three cases, no attempts were made by the agency to involve the youth or legal guardian in case planning.
- In a non-court involved case, there was no documented case plan on N-FOCUS or within the case file.
- Target child and parent indicated they did not feel a part of the case planning process. They felt the information was shared but they were never able to discuss the case plan. They did not feel their suggestions were ever considered by the worker.
- Parents indicated no involvement in case planning (father was deployed for period of time). Youth indicated that the case plan was discussed but youth was not involved in development of case plan outcomes. All parties indicated they were involved in discussions that that focused on case plan progress.
- Youth was aware of the case plan outcomes, but not involved in the development of outcomes. There were no attempts to involve either parent in the case plan process
- Youth was highly involved in the case plan process, but the agency did not appear to involve the adoptive mother in the process.
- Youth was highly involved in the case plan process, but the agency did not involve the mother. Parent spoke Spanish and no interpreter was provided for meetings with the agency staff.
- In three cases, the youth and mother were involved in the case plan process, but the agency did not appear to engage the father in process.
- Agency made minimal effort to engage the father in the case plan process.

### **Item 19. Worker visits with child**

**Reviewers were to determine the typical pattern of visits between the worker and child and if these visits were sufficient to ensure adequate monitoring of the child's safety and well being. Reviewers were also to determine whether visits focused on issues pertinent to case planning, service delivery, and achievement of the goals.**

#### ***Review Findings:***

- All cases were applicable to the Item.
- Six (32%) of the 19 cases were rated as a Strength.
  - 4 foster care cases and 2 in home cases were rated as Strength.
- Thirteen (68%) of the 19 cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.
  - 7 foster care cases and 6 in home cases were rated as Area Needing Improvement.

#### ***Strength:***

- Children and Families Services Specialist and/or Services Coordinator had a pattern of monthly visitation with the child (ren). Case file documentation indicated that the visits were private and were of quality by discussing such things as conditions of liberty, school, services, goals, outcomes, behaviors, relationships and medical information.
- In one instance, the child was on run status for a portion of the review. The Children and Family Services Specialist continued to document monthly attempts to locate the child.

#### ***Area Needing Improvement:***

- Cases that were found to need improvement were those cases where visits were less than once a month and/or quality of the visit was not sufficient to address issues pertaining to safety, permanency and well-being.
- Monthly visits need to be documented within the case record.
- Case file documentation of the monthly visit should reflect that the worker is meeting privately with the child when appropriate and topics of discussion focus on safety, permanency and well-being.
- With in home cases, all children need to have a documented monthly contact from the worker.

### **Item 20. Worker visits with parents**

**Reviewers were to assess whether the caseworker had sufficient face to face contact with parents to encourage attainment of their children's permanency goal while ensuring safety and well being. Cases that were considered not applicable if: (1) agency contact with the mother or father was determined to be contrary to a child's safety or best interests (and this is documented in the case file), (2) the location of the parent was unknown during the entire period under review, despite documented concerted agency efforts to locate her or him, (3) the parents' parental rights were terminated before the period under review and she or he is not involved in the child's life, or (4) during the entire period under review, the parent was not involved in the child's life or in case planning in any way despite agency efforts to involve her or him.**

#### ***Review Findings:***

- All cases were applicable to the Item.
- Two (11%) of the 19 cases were rated as a Strength.
  - 2 foster care cases were rated as Strength.

- 17 (89%) of the 19 cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.
  - 9 foster care cases and 8 in home cases were rated as Area Needing Improvement.

***Strength:***

- In one case the parents resided out of state. Mother left the state, worker continued to make efforts to locate her through family members. Worker continued to have monthly phone contact with the father that resided out of state.
- Monthly visits occurred with both parents on the in the home case.
- Case file documentation indicated that the visits were high quality, often discussing topics of safety, permanency and well-being.

***Area Needing Improvement:***

- Documentation needs to reflect monthly visits between worker, mother and father. If parent resides out of state or in prison, monthly phone contact is acceptable. If parent is unable to be located, efforts to locate need to be documented within the case record.
- Documentation needs to reflect that issues of safety, permanency and well-being are being discussed between the worker, mother and father.
- Visits that were occurring between the Children and Family Services Specialist and/or Services Coordinator with the parents are occurring at court, family team meetings or school. There was no indication that contacts between the worker and parent were occurring outside of formalized meetings.
- Face to face contact occurred with one parent on a monthly basis, no regular contact with the other parent. Efforts to contact other parent were not documented within the case file.
- No contact with the worker or parent for three months.
- No face to face contact with the worker while the child was in group home placement.
- Majority of contact with the father occurred through email, he would have liked regular face to face contact. Efforts to locate the mother were unknown.
- No contact with parent or guardian throughout the period under review.
- Translation services were not utilized in monthly contact between worker and parent.

***Outcome WB2: Children receive the appropriate educational services to meet their needs.***

**Status of Well-Being Outcome WB2**

	<b>Total Number</b>	<b>Total Percentage</b>
Substantially Achieved:	10	59%
Partially Achieved:	0	0%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	17	41%
Not Applicable:	2	11%

***Reviewer Comments WB2:***

- Needs were identified in most cases and educational records were located in the case file.

- In home cases that presented with educational issues, not all children in the home were assessed to determine if they had similar education needs.
- Need to address educational needs and post-educational needs of youth in GED program. Documentation of youth's progress on GED is needed within the case record.

**Item 21. Educational needs of the child**

**When addressing educational issues for families receiving in-home services, reviewers considered whether the educational needs are/were relevant to the reason why the agency is/was involved with the family, and whether the need to address educational issues is/was a reasonable expectation given the circumstances of the agency's involvement with the family. (If not, reviewers rated item 21 as not applicable.) Reviewers rated this item as a Strength if (1) the agency made extensive efforts to address the child's educational needs and the school system was unresponsive, especially if the problems are with a local school or jurisdiction; (2) if the child (ren)'s educational needs were assessed and addressed, including cases where the educational records were missing and the reasons why; or (3) if the agency conducted an assessment of educational issues and determined that there were no problems in that area, nor any need for educational services.**

***Review Findings:***

- 17 of the 19 cases were applicable to the Item.
- Ten (59%) of the 17 cases were rated as a Strength.
  - 8 foster care cases and 2 in home cases were rated as Strength.
- Seven (41%) of the 17 cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.
  - 2 foster care cases and 5 in home cases were rated as Area Needing Improvement.

***Strength:***

- Five cases contained an active IEP.
- Children and Family Services Specialist requested the school complete an assessment and implement IEP in order to address youth's needs. School was non-responsive to agency. Parent was able to provide an old IEP from another state, school at that point was responsive and updated youth's IEP.
- Documentation suggests education was evaluated, provider report contained youth's academics.
- Assessment of early childhood educational needs.
- Educational records were located in portion of files or there was documentation from providers that indicated youth's academic performance.

***Area Needing Improvement:***

- No documentation within the case file to indicate that the agency focused on education in order to prepare the youth for post-high school education. GAL report indicates the child had to apply to a different school due to her low ACT scores and unacceptable math credits.
- Youth had behavioral needs in the school environment. Instead of completing an educational assessment, youth dropped out of school to pursue his GED.
- Youth was failing a class and struggling in several other classes, no further assessment was completed to assist the youth. There was no documentation regarding school needs of the other children in the home.

- Family came to the agency's attention due to educational neglect. Case file indicates the agency only secured school records one time with no documented contacts between the worker and school. It was unclear in the case file if the children's attendance affected their academics.
- In two cases, truancy was one of the youths' issues that brought the case to the agency's attention. There was some acceptable education documentation in the case file on the youth, but the case file did not have educational information on the other children in the home in order to determine if they have truancy issues or educational needs.
- Documentation in the case file indicated that the youth needed to enroll in GED following discharge from YRTC. There is no indication that the agency assisted the youth in enrolling or attaining a GED.

***Outcome WB3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.***

**Status of Well-Being Outcome WB3:**

	<b>Total Number</b>	<b>Total Percentage</b>
Substantially Achieved:	6	33%
Partially Achieved:	3	17%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	9	50%
Not Applicable:	1	5%

***Reviewer Comments WB3:***

- The cases that were rated as strengths had documentation that medical examinations, dental examinations and mental health assessments were completed accordingly. Documentation indicated that services were provided to address identified medical, dental and mental needs.
- Cases identified as area needing improvement lacked documentation of ongoing assessment of the youth's physical and mental health needs.
- If ongoing physical health and mental health assessments were completed, case file did not contain the results of these assessments.

**Item 22. Physical health of the child**

When addressing health issues for families receiving in-home services, reviewers considered whether the physical health needs are/were relevant to the reason why the agency is/was involved with the family and whether the need to address physical health issues is/was a reasonable expectation given the circumstances of the agency's involvement with the family. (If not, reviewers rated this item as not applicable.) For example, if a child became known to the agency and was determined to be in need of in-home services at least partly as a result of physical abuse or sexual abuse, then it is reasonable to expect the agency to provide services to ensure that the child receives the appropriate physical health services. Reviewers rated this item as a Strength if the agency conducted an assessment of



**physical health and determined that there were no problems in that area, nor any need for physical health services.**

***Review Findings:***

- 14 of the 19 cases were applicable to the Item.
- Five (36%) of the 14 cases were rated as a Strength.
  - All five cases rated as Strength were foster care cases.
- Nine (64%) of the 14 cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.
  - 6 foster care cases and 3 in home cases were rated as Area Needing Improvement.

***Strength:***

- Five cases contained documentation of routine health and dental examinations. Services provided to meet any identified needs. Services provided include immunizations, nutritionist, inhalers and dental work.

***Area Needing Improvement:***

- In three cases, there were no documentation of routine health and dental examinations.
- No documentation of the results of the routine health and dental examinations. Reviewer was unable to determine if youth had medical or dental needs.
- In four cases, there were no updated dental examinations. In one instance, there was a court order for the agency to arrange a dental examination.
- Case came to the attention of the agency due to educational neglect. There were significant concerns regarding the children's absences. There was no documentation within the case file that assessed physical health needs as it may relate to the high level of school absences.
- No documented medical or dental care needs during the period under review. Case documentation indicates there are some serious medical issues such as obesity, diabetes, wisdom teeth extraction and seasonal allergies.

**Item 23. Mental health of the child**

**Reviewers were to determine whether during the period under review, the agency addressed the mental/behavioral health needs of the child (ren). Reviewers rated this Item as a Strength if the agency conducted an assessment, either initially or ongoing, of the child's mental health and implemented appropriate mental health services based upon those needs. In-home services cases are not applicable for an assessment of this Item if the reviewer determines that there is no reason to expect that, during the period under review, the agency would address mental/behavioral health issues for any children in the family, given the reason for agency involvement or the circumstances of the case.**

***Review Findings:***

- 15 of the 19 cases were applicable to the Item.
- Eight (53%) of the 15 cases were rated as a Strength.
  - 6 foster care cases and 2 in home cases were rated as Strength.
- Seven (47%) of the 15 cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement
  - 3 foster care cases and 4 in home cases were rated as Area Needing Improvement.



***Strength:***

- Cases contained had formal assessments of mental health needs, services provided to meet those needs and documentation in the file to show progress. Evaluations included psychological/psychiatric evaluations, substance abuse evaluations and mental status exams.

***Area Needing Improvement:***

- In two cases, target youth were under the care of a psychiatrist and taking medication in previous documents. Updated reports did not contain any information on the psychiatric medication and if youth were discharged from these mental health services.
- Discharge from therapeutic program indicated youth was to receive updated mental health status and individual therapy. There was no documentation within the case file to suggest that the youth received these services.
- No evidence of ongoing assessment of child's mental health needs. Child was diagnosed with bi-polar and compliance for mental health services have been an issue, did not appear the worker continually addressed it as the case was coming to closure. Youth failed to participate in drug testing on one occasion, no follow up by the worker if the youth is using illegal substances. There was no substance abuse evaluation.
- No discharge summary from therapist to indicate accomplishment of therapeutic goals.
- In home case did not assess all children within the home in which there was significant mental health history or evidence that the other siblings may be affected by the youth's mental health issues.
- Mental health services were not provided to all of the children within the home.

## ESA Results

**Case Sample:** 2<sup>nd</sup> - Mini CFSR Review – April 2010

**Type of Review:** 2<sup>nd</sup> Mini CFSR

**Report Type:** Eastern Service Area

**Number of Reviews:** 19

**Review Period:** April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2009 – April 5<sup>th</sup>, 2010

### PERFORMANCE ITEM RESULTS

Performance Item		Item Ratings (#)			Item Ratings (%)		
		S	ANI	N/A	S	ANI	N/A
Item 1:	Timeliness of initiating investigations	1	2	16	33%	67%	84%
Item 2:	Repeat maltreatment	2	0	17	100%	0%	89%
Item 3:	Services to family	5	2	12	71%	29%	63%
Item 4:	Risk assessment and safety management	13	6	-	68%	32%	-
Item 5:	Foster care re-entries	2	0	17	100%	0%	89%
Item 6:	Stability of foster care placement	9	2	8	82%	18%	42%
Item 7:	Permanency goal for child	2	9	8	18%	82%	42%
Item 8:	Reunification, guardianship etc	3	3	13	50%	50%	68%
Item 9:	Adoption	0	2	17	0%	100%	89%
Item 10:	Other planned permanent living arrangement	3	3	13	50%	50%	68%
Item 11:	Proximity of foster care placement	11	0	8	100%	0%	42%
Item 12:	Placement with siblings	1	1	17	50%	50%	89%
Item 13:	Visiting with parents and siblings	6	5	8	55%	45%	42%
Item 14:	Preserving connections	7	4	8	64%	36%	42%
Item 15:	Relative placement	2	2	15	50%	50%	79%
Item 16:	Relationship of child in care with parents	6	5	8	55%	45%	42%
Item 17:	Needs and services	5	14	-	26%	74%	-
Item 18:	Child and family involvement in case planning	6	13	-	32%	68%	-
Item 19:	Caseworker visits with child	6	13	-	32%	68%	-
Item 20:	Caseworker visits with parent(s)	2	17	-	11%	89%	-
Item 21:	Educational needs of the child	10	7	2	59%	41%	11%
Item 22:	Physical health of the child	5	9	5	36%	64%	26%
Item 23:	Mental/behavioral health of the child	8	7	4	53%	47%	21%

### OUTCOME RESULTS

Performance Outcome	COUNTS (#)				PERCENTAGES (%)			
	SA	PA	NACH	N/A	SA	PA	NACH	N/A
Safety 1 (Items 1-2)	1	1	1	16	33%	33%	33%	84%
Safety 2 (Items 3-4)	12	3	4	-	63%	16%	21%	-
Permanency 1 (Items 5-10)	1	9	1	8	9%	82%	9%	42%
Permanency 2 (Items 11-16)	7	4	0	8	64%	36%	0%	42%
Wellbeing 1 (Items 17-20)	3	6	10	-	16%	32%	53%	-
Wellbeing 2 (Item 21)	10	0	7	2	59%	0%	41%	11%
Wellbeing 3 (Items 22-23)	6	3	9	1	33%	17%	50%	5%

**KEY:**

N/A = Not Applicable

PA = Partially Achieved

NACH = Not Achieved

S = Strength

SA = Substantially Achieved

ANI = Area Needing Improvement